

The Lifting Children and Families Out of Poverty Task Force

Draft Recommendations – 10/29/2018

Exhibit 14. Housing and homelessness recommendations

Recommendation	Tier	Target population	Potential cost
1. Protection and assistance for families using Section 8 and other rent vouchers.	Immediate	Individuals and families in poverty, deep poverty, and those at risk of poverty.	\$15 million annual state costs to provide incentives averaging \$3,000 for 5,000 families. Administrative and enforcement costs
<p>Description: Further define “source of income” in the state’s list of tenant characteristics (such as disability and family status) that are protected from discrimination to include/define HUD Housing Choice Vouchers (HCV) or other rental assistance programs as income, to protect Section 8 clients and clients of other rental assistance programs. Provide landlord incentives - such as to cover rents until vouchers become available and for damage in excess of security deposits.</p> <p>Evidence: Descriptive evidence shows HCV voucher holders are less successful in finding housing in tight housing markets, and anecdotal evidence suggests racial disparities among those experiencing homelessness and housing instability, as well as housing discrimination.</p>			
2. Fund shallow rental subsidies	Immediate	Families with children in deep poverty.	State costs of \$1.3 billion, assuming subsidy of \$500 per month to cover about 220,000 families in deep poverty.
<p>Description: Fund shallow rental subsidies (flat dollar subsidies based on unit size) for families with children in deep poverty (using the California Poverty Measure). Subsidies could be time-limited or ongoing.</p> <p>Evidence: For families with children, direct rental assistance may be more cost-efficient and less disruptive to children than short shelter stays. Shallow rent subsidies are used in a number of areas, including Oregon, Minnesota, Illinois, and the District of Columbia to keep families who are in their current housing, and communities find that the costs of providing short-term subsidies are lower than the cost of providing shelter. The Bringing Families Home (BFH) pilot in Contra Costa County includes shallow rental subsidies, in addition to section 8 vouchers and permanent housing units. CDSS is working with UC-Berkeley and the Children’s Data Network to do an evaluation of BFH - results will be coming in the next 18 months.</p>			
3. Implement rent stabilization and housing supply provisions	Immediate	Provisions would apply, to varying degrees, to most families, but primary focus would be on families in poverty, deep poverty, or at risk of poverty.	Administrative and support costs.
<p>Description: Impose both (1) state rent stabilization and (2) a set of housing supply provisions in localities falling short of their low-income housing goals and/or experiencing rent increases in excess of inflation. Rent control would apply to non-luxury rental units built more than 12 years prior (if Proposition 10 fails, it would apply only to pre-1995 units). Would not apply to vacant units and would include provisions prohibiting eviction without just-cause. Housing supply provisions would require that the locality reduce zoning and regulatory requirements on low income housing, particularly in infill and transit-adjacent areas and on public lands, and, for the localities covered by this proposal, would modify existing provisions in state law relating to density bonuses, with the goal of encouraging more set-asides for affordable housing.</p> <p>Evidence: Research on San Francisco rent control policies shows that tenants in rent-controlled units, particularly elderly renters and families who have been at the address for a long time, are more likely to remain at the same address with rent control. However, landlords affected by rent control may also reduce rental housing supply. A 2015 study by the California Legislative Analyst’s Office (LAO) found that California faces a major housing shortage with major impacts on low income Californians. The LAO recommended actions to facilitate construction of high-density housing, such as changes to local land</p>			

use authority, local finance, and CEQA reform, particularly in regions where housing shortages are most acute. Estimates of effects of specific housing supply policies are provided in an analysis by U.C. Berkeley.

4. Expand Bringing Families Home program statewide

Comprehensive

Primarily children and families in deep poverty.

Low tens of millions per year.

Description: Bringing Families Home is currently a pilot program in 12 counties which aims to assist child welfare involved families who are homeless find and maintain safe, stable housing through rapid rehousing (rental subsidy plus intensive case management), HUD vouchers, or permanent supportive housing.

Evidence: CDSS is working with UC-Berkeley and the Children's Data Network to do an evaluation of BFH - results will be coming in the next 18 months.

5. Provide housing subsidies for homeless families and youth

Comprehensive

Children and families in deep poverty.

\$36 million in state costs annually. Assumes 2,000 families receive \$1,000 rental subsidy and \$500 in support services per month. (Total also includes administrative costs).

Description: Provide ongoing housing subsidies and services for families and youth experiencing homelessness to access private-market housing or affordable housing to end homelessness among this population. Approach could be considered for youth exiting the juvenile justice system who are at risk of homelessness upon reentry.

Evidence: The HUD Family Options Study shows that families getting ongoing rental assistance are far more likely to exit homelessness and remain stably housed than rapid re-housing, shelter, or transitional housing programs.

6. Provide eviction defense

Comprehensive

Children and families in poverty and deep poverty, or at risk of being in poverty.

High tens of millions of dollars in state costs annually.

Description: Provide state funding to support eviction court representation for low-income Californians facing eviction.

Evidence: Experimental studies show that tenants with attorneys were less likely to be evicted than self-represented tenants. An ordinance providing funds to support legal representation in eviction court was passed in San Francisco in 2018.

7. Provide housing vouchers for transition age youth in foster care

Comprehensive

Primarily young adults in poverty and deep poverty, but potentially small number not in poverty.

\$12 million (state funds) first year, rising to \$60 million by fifth year and holding steady thereafter.

Description: Provide housing vouchers until their 26th birthday for young adults aging out of extended foster care.

Evidence: Youth aging out of foster care are among the population at greatest risk for becoming homeless. In a descriptive study of foster care youth up to age 26, nearly one third of study participants experienced homelessness after leaving foster care. While youth up to age 24 aging out of foster care are able to receive time-limited housing vouchers (up to 18 months) under HUD's Family Unification Program, there is not available evidence of the take up or impact of this program.

Exhibit 15. Social safety net recommendations

Recommendation	Tier	Target population	Potential cost
1. Expand CalEITC amount and population	Immediate	Primarily families in poverty and deep poverty.	About \$400 million annually (state funds) to further support work participation by adults with children.

Description: Expand the CalEITC amount and the CalEITC eligible population

Evidence: The EITC may help reduce family poverty by as much as one-tenth and childhood poverty by as much as one-fourth among families who receive it. However, current estimates may be underestimated by up to 50 percent because they fail to account for the induced earnings effects. Accounting for the fact that the EITC nudges single mothers to increase their work activity, a \$1,000 increase in the EITC is estimated to reduce the share of families living in poverty (after tax and transfer) by about 8 percentage points.

2. Establish a tax credit for adults with children in deep poverty.	Immediate	Families in deep poverty.	\$1.5 billion annually (state funds).
--	-----------	---------------------------	---------------------------------------

Description: Low-income families with dependent children under age 18 would file an income tax return with information on: (1) income from all sources, including federal/state/local public assistance payments such as CalWORKs, CalFresh, SSI/SSP, child care subsidies, and housing subsidies; (2) unreimbursed expenses for specific items, including child care and medical costs; (3) their family size and number of dependent children under 18; and (4) their address.

Once that information is submitted, the California Franchise Tax Board (FTB) would determine the deep poverty threshold, as measured by the CPM, based on the information provided on the return regarding family size and place of residence.

The FTB would then compare the deep poverty threshold to the family's net income and make a payment to the family equal to the gap. Funds would be disbursed via a monthly distribution mechanism.

Evidence: Under current law, many children under the age of 17 live in families without enough earnings to qualify for the full child tax credit. Research strongly indicates that even relatively modest increases in family income, particularly for children in the poorest families, can lead to better outcomes in health and education and can have lasting positive effects on economic mobility and opportunity.

3. Increase CalWORKs grants	Immediate	Primary impact on families in deep poverty.	\$1.2 billion annually relative to current grant levels. (Increases are consistent with intent language in AB 1811, which would raise grants for each participating household to 50% of the federal poverty level for a one-size larger family.
------------------------------------	-----------	---	---

Description: Increase CalWORKs grants deep poverty within CalWORKs. Currently, CalWORKs grant levels are below the threshold for deep child poverty (50% of the federal poverty level (FPL)). Increasing the grant amount for CalWORKs families 50% of the FPL (for a one-size larger family unit) would help alleviate deep child poverty in the state.

Evidence: Researchers found the growth in the number of families living in extreme poverty took place among the groups most affected by welfare reform. As fewer families received TANF, the number of families living in deep poverty rose.

4. Align CalWORKs time limits for supportive services with federal limits	Comprehensive	Children and families in deep poverty.	\$70 in state funds annually
--	---------------	--	------------------------------

Description: Align CalWORKs time limits for supportive services with the federal 60-month time limit. Currently, California imposes a 48-month time limit on CalWORKs assistance. Time limit for cash grants would remain at 48 months but supportive services would be allowed to continue for families in need for up to one year after timing off.

Evidence: Shorter time limits mean that sometimes families cannot access assistance when they need it most (in a crisis) because they already used up the total time allowed for program participation.

5. Fund summer lunch program and develop EBT pilot.	Comprehensive	Children and families in deep poverty.	Depends on size of pilot: \$120 per child per summer.
--	---------------	--	---

Description: Fund summer lunch in libraries and develop an Electronic Benefit Transfer (EBT) pilot to distribute a monthly benefit during the summer on SNAP or WIC EBT cards to children eligible for free or reduced-price school meals.

Evidence: Children who receive free or reduced-price lunch during the school year have higher food insufficiency rates in the summer. Providing summer nutrition programs can greatly reduce the number of children who are food insecure.

6. Expand usage of Community Eligibility Provision in California school meals.	Comprehensive	Primarily children and families in poverty and deep poverty, though could benefit others without regard to poverty status.	\$100 million in state funds annually.
---	---------------	--	--

Description: Build on a state/federal program already in place, the community eligibility provision (CEP), in which schools dispense with applications for free-reduced meals and instead cover all students in schools based on an approved federal reimbursement formula. Currently CA implements the CEP in high poverty schools where the costs are largely covered by federal funds. This proposal would expand this to more schools and provide state funds to offset district costs in cases where federal funds do not fully cover meal expenses.

Evidence: Approaches such as community eligibility aim to increase access to school meals for low-income children. In Illinois, Kentucky, and Michigan, schools that participated in community eligibility for two years increased average daily participation in the National School Lunch Program by 13 percent and average daily participation in the School Breakfast Program by 25 percent.

7. Increase SNAP benefit of \$30 per month for families with children age 0-5.	Comprehensive	Primarily children and families in deep poverty.	\$342 million in state costs annually.
---	---------------	--	--

Description: Increase the SNAP benefit amount for families with children age 0-5 and pregnant women. SNAP benefits often run out before the end of the month, which can leave families with limited access to nutritious foods.

Evidence: Research has revealed that SNAP has a profound impact on children's health and well-being throughout their lifespan.

8. Prevent SNAP sanctions	Comprehensive	Primarily children and families in deep poverty.	Total costs of \$6 million annually. Most expenditures likely from federal funds but potential for moderate state costs in initial years.
----------------------------------	---------------	--	---

Description: Prevent SNAP sanctions for families with children 0-5 and pregnant women. Currently, CalFresh (California's SNAP program) imposes concurrent sanctions when a family fails to comply with the Welfare-to-Work (WTW) requirements for CalWORKs, causing families to lose their CalWORKs and CalFresh benefits simultaneously.

Evidence: Research has revealed that SNAP has a profound impact on children's health and well-being throughout their lifespan.

Exhibit 16. Early childhood recommendations

Recommendation	Tier	Target population	Potential cost
1. Raise parental leave wage replacement rates 100 percent for low income workers.	Immediate	Primary impact on children and families in poverty and deep poverty. Also those at risk of poverty.	\$300 million in additional costs annually. Under current law, added costs would be funded by an increase in the SDI employee withholding rate.
<p>Description: Increase wage replacement to 100 percent for low-wage workers, increase utilization of paid leave policies, and consider extending the length of job protection and paid leave to ensure low-wage working families have economic supports during their infant's earliest weeks.</p> <p>Evidence: Parental leave expansions are associated with increased leave-taking by both mothers and fathers. Increases in leave length are larger for college-educated or married mothers than for less-educated or single mothers. Paid parental leave is also associated with increases in women's employment.</p>			
2. Guarantee child care subsidies/access to subsidized slots for families, including a rate reimbursement increase for programs serving families in deep poverty.	Immediate/Foundational	Children and families in poverty and deep poverty.	\$1.5 billion annually to begin with provide slots to children ages 0-4 in deep poverty; \$3.5 billion to provide to provide slots to children ages 0-4 in poverty.
<p>Description: Expand existing subsidy programs to guarantee that all children 0-8 living in poverty have access to a child care/early learning subsidy or CDE contracted services. Achieve a subsidy guarantee of access for all children living in deep poverty by 2022 and all children living in poverty by 2026.</p> <p>Evidence: Several studies have found that child care subsidies increase employment among low-income mothers.</p>			
3. Establish a tiered reimbursement structure to incentivize, reward and retain higher levels of workforce competencies necessary to expand access and achieve positive outcomes	Foundational	Children and families in poverty and deep poverty	TBD
<p>Description: Establish a single tiered reimbursement structure for the subsidized child care and early learning system that is tied to provider competencies, educational attainment, and professional development to incentivize the provision of higher quality services. This structure should cover the cost of ongoing quality improvement and promote equitable access to services throughout the state.</p> <p>Evidence: [Need evidence]</p>			
4. Increase ECE workforce quality	Comprehensive	Focus on children and families in poverty and deep poverty but would impact other children without regard to poverty status.	Mid to high tens of millions of dollars annually.
<p>Description: Expand access to effective training, professional development, and coaching to sustain and expand and sustain a well-trained and fairly compensated workforce and coordinated early childhood services.</p>			

Evidence: Children in poverty are more likely to be in lower quality settings than children from middle-income families when evidence has shown that they benefit the most. Increased access to higher quality programs improves children's school readiness and academic achievement. An experimental study found that up to 2 hours of in-classroom coaching per week had a large impact on observed environment quality in just six months and impacts were particularly large on the quality of interactions between the adults and children. Another impact evaluation focused on the Program for Infant/Toddler Caregivers, which was an intensive 18-month professional development and coaching intervention for teachers of infants and toddlers in centers and home-based child care settings. Results revealed no impacts 6 and 24 months after random assignment, either on program quality or on children's outcomes.

DRAFT

Exhibit 17. Education, workforce, and training recommendations

Recommendation	Tier	Target population	Potential cost
1. Fund supportive services	Immediate	Primarily adults and families in deep poverty.	\$25 million in state funds, assuming 10,000 served and a cap of \$5,000 in supportive services per person. Also assumes that 50% of cost covered by federal SNAP education and training reimbursement.

Description: Provide a dedicated source of state funds for supportive services for workforce and education program participants to ensure participants can complete programs.

Evidence: There is no rigorous evidence, but these services are consistent with findings about common reasons for not completing programs. For example, in unpublished findings associated with the WIA evaluation, the lack of child care or affordable transportation were the primary reasons many individuals did not complete their vocational training programs.

2. Ensure existing and future Local Control Funding Formula (LCFF) funding be accounted for at the school level, as well as other state, local and federal funds, in comparable ways to ensure that the supplemental and concentration grants generated by children living in poverty, foster youth and/or English Language Learners are expended on students in these subgroups. In addition, California schools are underfunded and this disproportionately impacts those students living in poverty. Policymakers should evaluate LCFF's funding level and work with stakeholders to set a new, more adequate funding target that builds on the equitable funding mechanisms embedded in the formula and achieves expected outcomes for students.	Immediate	Children/families in poverty and deep poverty.	Proposal could result in both a reallocation of existing state expenditures within Proposition 98 and, potentially, an increase in total state funding for schools, depending on the results of Legislative reassessment of the adequacy of the current LCFF formula.
--	-----------	--	---

Description: Existing and future LCFF funding must be accounted for at the school level, as well as other state, local and federal funds, in comparable ways to ensure that the supplemental and concentration grants generated by children living in poverty, foster youth and/or English Language Learners are expended on students in these subgroups. In addition, California schools are underfunded, and this disproportionately impacts those students living in poverty. Policymakers should evaluate LCFF's funding level and work with stakeholders to set a new, more adequate base funding target that builds on the equitable funding mechanisms embedded in the formula.

This must be paired with expected outcomes for educational institutions to improve the educational attainment of low-income children, eliminate achievement gaps and barriers to regular school attendance (e.g., transportation, medical and/or mental health services, socioemotional support services), provide full-day opportunities (e.g., expanded learning and extracurricular activities), strengthen family engagement, and leverage community resources. Greater accountability and monitoring by the California Department of Education is needed to ensure that additional funding for low-income children actually benefits low-income children and results in increased or improved services for them as opposed to schoolwide or districtwide expenditures that are not based on a clear consideration of the needs, conditions, or circumstances of low-income children.

Evidence: In two studies, researchers found that sustained funding increases substantially improved student academic achievement, especially for low-income school districts. In neither study were the funding increases tied to specific outcomes like family engagement, full-day schooling, and leveraging community resources, though those intermediate outcomes are independently linked with higher academic achievement.

3. Prioritize parents living in poverty in workforce and training programs	Immediate	Children and families in poverty and deep poverty.	\$300 million annually in state costs to provide an average \$10,000 in services to an additional 30,000 adults.
---	-----------	--	--

Description: Establish a new priority of service requirement to ensure workforce and training programs are prioritizing parents living in poverty without displacing current participants. Dedicate state funding to offset the long-term decline in federal funding of these programs.

Evidence: Evidence for sector-based programs—providing both training and placement services designed to prepare participants for jobs in sectors with local labor market demand—is thinner but more promising than the mixed evidence for traditional vocational programs. Research suggests sectoral programs can lead to increased earnings and employment in high-quality jobs with better career potential.

4. Create career pipeline opportunities for youth	Comprehensive	Youth/young adults in poverty and deep poverty	\$250 million per year, assuming that 20,000 served, and 12,500 per individual.
--	---------------	--	---

Description: Increase pre-apprenticeship, apprenticeship, and summer employment opportunities for youth in poverty and create a source of dedicated funding for “earn and learn” activities targeted for individuals and families with barriers to employment.

Evidence: There is strong evidence that such programs improve labor market outcomes for years beyond program participation. For example, Reed et al. (2012) found that registered apprenticeship programs increased employment rates by over 8 percentage points and earnings by about \$6,000 annually when they examined participants six and nine years after enrollment. Similarly, Kemple and Willner (2008) found that career academies that combined youth vocational training with job-shadowing, on-the-job-training, internships, and career guidance had persistent earnings impacts five to eight years after program participation.

5. Increase access to occupational licenses and credentials	Comprehensive	Children, families, and adults in poverty and deep poverty.	Minor state costs to administer the change on forms.
--	---------------	---	--

Description: Ensure all California residents in poverty have a greater ability to participate in the workforce by requiring the entities responsible for licensing and credentialing various occupations (i.e. Commission on Teacher Credentialing, Emergency Medical Services Authority, etc.) to fully implement their authorization to use an individual tax identification number in lieu of a social security number.

Evidence: [Need evidence]

Exhibit 18. Special populations recommendations

Recommendation	Tier	Target population	Potential cost
1. Waive outstanding juvenile court fees and fines	Immediate	Primarily children and families in poverty and deep poverty but would impact others without regard to poverty status.	Likely net one-time costs to local governments in low millions of dollars. Estimate reflects both low recovery rates for outstanding debt and the fact that Los Angeles County and several other local jurisdictions have already waived outstanding debts.

Description: Youth living in poverty who have been involved in the criminal justice system—whether through arrest or incarceration—are often burdened with extensive fines and fees. Pass an addendum to SB 190, which limited juvenile fees going forward, that waives or forgives outstanding debt related to these fees for juveniles living in poverty.

Evidence: Research shows that juvenile fees are extremely harmful to families, frequently implemented unlawfully, and costly for counties to administer. SB 190, passed in October 2017, repealed county authority to charge fees to parents for their children's interactions with the juvenile justice system, including administrative fees for children's detention, legal representation, probation supervision, electronic monitoring, and drug testing in the juvenile justice system. However, many families in California still have fines and fees issued prior to the passage of the new law.

Add similar policy Los Angeles County and other counties have adopted

2. Create stronger statutory safeguards to protect low-income children and families from being referred to the juvenile court, prosecuted, and fined for truancy.	Immediate	Primarily children and families in poverty and deep poverty but would impact others without regard to poverty status.	State mandated local cost potential in the low millions of dollars.
--	-----------	---	---

Description: Strengthen existing duties to identify and address the root causes of school attendance issues through school, district, and School Attendance Review Board (SARB) level interventions prior to, and as a prerequisite for, juvenile court intervention. Clarify that responses to truancy should be non-punitive and promote the student's success at school while referrals to alternative education programs and/or the courts for truancy should be actions of last resort.

Evidence: Kaplan, Alexander, Ahmed Lavalais, Tim Kline, Jenna Le, Rachel Draznin-Nagy, Ingrid Rodriguez, Jenny van der Heyde, Stephanie Campos-Bui, and Jeffrey Selbin. (2016.) High Pain, No Gain: How Juvenile Administrative Fees Harm Low-Income Families in Alameda County, California. Available at <https://ssrn.com/abstract=2738710>.

3. Expand the Child Care Bridge Program to Meet the Needs of Children in Foster Care	Foundational	Children in poverty and deep poverty.	Annual cost of \$85 million (state funds) to expand to eligible children ages 0-12; \$45 million for children 0-3.
---	--------------	---------------------------------------	--

Description: Expand the Child Care Bridge ("Bridge") program for foster families, to ensure that vouchers are available to help caregivers access child care immediately upon placement of a child in their home and that all foster children can access ongoing child care to ensure stability in their placement.

Currently, there is a total allocation of \$31 million to be divided among counties that elect to participate. The \$31 million is insufficient to meet the needs of all children who need the support of the Bridge Program. This proposal would extend the Bridge Program to ensure that all emergency caregivers and resource families have access to trauma informed child care.

Evidence: Several studies demonstrate that early supportive, responsive relationships prevent and reverse the effects of abuse and neglect and participation in the foster care system.

4. Provide adequate and appropriate housing for transition-age youth.	Foundational	Youth in poverty and deep poverty.	Providing additional 4,000 THP-Plus housing slots would cost approximately \$80 million in state funds annually, partly offset by a \$10 million reduction in SILP payments.
--	--------------	------------------------------------	--

Description: Provide adequate and appropriate housing for Transition Age Youth (TAY) and non-minor dependents (NMD). Housing instability and homelessness significantly hinder foster youths' pursuit of higher education, meaningful employment, and self-sufficiency. The child welfare system is one of the main pipelines into homelessness. To stem the flow of foster youth into homelessness, invest in long-term housing stability for this population.

Evidence: TAY and NMD are at significant risk of chronic homelessness, decreased educational and employment outcomes, increased likelihood of poverty and increased likelihood of interaction with the justice system if they are not supported as they transition from childhood to adulthood and strive to achieve self-sufficiency.

5. Examine strategies and opportunities to increase contact visiting between children and their parents at local jails that give children the opportunity to touch and hug their parents.	Immediate	Primarily children and families in poverty and deep poverty but would impact others without regard to poverty status.	Potential mandated local cost, reimbursable by the State.
--	-----------	---	---

Description: Ensure that family issues are assessed and addressed during jail or prison intake and during reentry planning processes throughout a parent's involvement in the criminal justice system.

Evidence: A survey of incarcerated parents and their children revealed that children of incarcerated parents' lives can be significantly more complicated than their peers with parents living in the community (Kramer, K. and the Children of Incarcerated Parents Jail Survey Teams. Descriptive Overview of Parents, Children and Incarceration in Alameda and San Francisco County Jails. Alameda County Children of Incarcerated Parents Partnership & San Francisco Children of Incarcerated Parents Partnership. Zellerbach Family Foundation, (March 2016).)

6. School Stability for highly mobile populations: Fully fund transportation support for all youth who have a right to remain in their school of origin. Further establish alternative transportation options, with funding, for those youth who have a right to remain in school of origin when their parent/caregiver is unable to provide transportation.	Foundational	Children in poverty and deep poverty.	\$60M
---	--------------	---------------------------------------	-------

Description: This proposal ensures we are fully resourcing existing state and federal law by developing a clear and accessible rate and methodology for determining travel reimbursement for all children who have a right to remain in their school of origin.

Currently, there is only an established rate and methodology for transportation reimbursement for children who are placed in a foster home leaving many other children (including youth who have exited to permanency, youth who have reunified with a parent, homeless youth, and youth in residential placements or shelter care) who have the right to remain in SOO without identified funding to effectuate that right.

Evidence: Significant disparity in school suspensions continues to be of concern and while suspensions have dropped significantly across all student groups over a recent five-year period alarming levels of lost days of instruction from suspensions remain, especially among African- Americans, Native Americans and students with disabilities. Only 51% of foster youth graduate high school compared to 84% state average. (California Department of Education)

7. Fully fund the Youth Reinvestment Program	Comprehensive	Primarily children and families in poverty and deep poverty.	About \$60 million per year.
---	---------------	--	------------------------------

Description: Fully fund the Youth Reinvestment program to support diversion programming that can reduce unnecessary youth contact with the juvenile justice system.

Evidence: Several studies support the benefits and outcomes of diversion programs. A meta-analysis of pre-charge diversion programs for youth found that programs providing just a caution (with no referral to services) and programs providing an intervention are both more effective than the traditional justice system in reducing recidivism; however, a second meta-analysis found no difference in the outcomes of diverted youth and traditionally processed youth. For youth on probation, therapeutic interventions can be more effective at preventing repeat offenses than punishment-based approaches are, and therapy is often incorporated into probation supervision practices or used as an alternative to incarceration.

8. Facilitate post-secondary education for justice involved and foster youth	Comprehensive	Primarily young adults in poverty and deep poverty.	\$11.5 million in state funds annually
---	---------------	---	--

Description: Provide all students who have obtained their high school diploma or equivalent while detained with the option of enrolling in a college course and/or a CTE program. Eventually, this policy could expand to provide dual-enrollment and college counseling/financial aid counseling to those youth not yet eligible to enroll full-time in post-secondary schools.

Evidence: There are several successful examples of such programs, including Project Change at the College of San Mateo County, CA and Oregon Youth Authority's post-secondary education programming.

9. Enhance transition support for justice-involved youth	Comprehensive	Primarily children and families in poverty and deep poverty.	State costs of about \$11 million annually assuming about 1,100 youth exiting juvenile justice facilities with a GED or high school diploma and an average of \$10,000 of services per individual.
---	---------------	--	--

Description: Current state laws do not assign responsibility of students' re-entry transitions to a singular agency due to the nature of multi-agency collaboration that is required for re-entry. Currently, only County Offices of Education and County Probation Departments are mandated parties for joint transition plans. School districts and the County agency dedicated to labor or workforce should also be required parties.

Evidence: Joseph Gasper, Stefanie DeLuca, and Angela Estacion, "Switching Schools: Reconsidering the Relationship Between School Mobility and High School Dropout," American Educational Research Journal 49 no. 3 (June 2012) 487-519, <https://doi.org/10.3102/0002831211415250>.

Elysia V. Clemens, Kristin Klopfenstein, Trent L. Lalonde, and Matt Tis, "The Effects of Placement and School Stability on Academic Growth Trajectories of Students in Foster Care," Children and Youth Services Review 87 (2018): 86-94, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.childyouth.2018.02.015>.

10. Create and expand Kinship Navigator programs	Comprehensive	Children in deep poverty.	Approximately \$6 million over next 3-4 years.
---	---------------	---------------------------	--

Description: Create and expand Kinship Navigator programs

Evidence: Placement with relative caregivers offers placement in a family-like setting and can provide consistency and stability, preserving family connections and maintaining cultural customs. However, the large majority hail from socially disadvantaged backgrounds with large numbers living in poverty. Children living with grandparents (but not parents or other relatives) face the highest odds of poverty (<https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC5484162/>).

11. Create funding streams to support preventive and treatment services for those children most impacted by incarceration.	TBD	TBD	TBD
---	-----	-----	-----

Description: The trauma of parental incarceration and the stigma associated with having a parent behind bars impacts the emotional and behavioral development of many children. Children and their caregivers need access to supportive peer networks, counseling/therapy, homework/tutoring, restorative justice, and professional guidance to help assist with their unique needs.

Evidence: While many of the risk factors children of incarcerated parents experience may be related to parental substance abuse, mental health, inadequate education, or other challenges, parental incarceration increases the risk of children living in poverty or experiencing household instability independent of these other problems.

(Phillips, S.D., Errantly, A., Keeler, G.P., Costello, J.E., An gold, A., Johnston, D., et al. (2006). Disentangling the risks: Parent criminal justice involvement and children's exposure to family risks. *Criminology and Public Policy*, 5, 677–702

"Parental incarceration is now recognized as an "adverse childhood experience" (ACE); it is distinguished from other adverse childhood experiences by the unique combination of trauma, shame, and stigma."

(Hairston, C.F. (2007). Focus on the children with incarcerated parents: A overview of the research literature. Annie E. Casey Foundation.)

12. Implement a statewide pilot project to create additional Regional CCIPs (Children of Incarcerated Parents Partnerships).	TBD	TBD	TBD
---	-----	-----	-----

Description: This project would identify additional regions in the state with a large number of children with incarcerated parents and build CCIPs that are funded by State and County resources so that there is dedicated funding to staff and support coordination of regional coalitions. The key purpose is to promote the Children of Incarcerated Parents Bill of Rights (<https://www.sfcipp.org/blank>).

Evidence: On any given day, there are more than 3,000 children aged 25 years or younger with parents in Alameda or San Francisco County Jails (Kramer).

13. Promote placement stability for foster and homeless youth.	TBD	Primarily children and families in poverty and deep poverty, as well as children who are not in poverty. There are approximately 60,000 children in foster care in California.	<p>Estimated first-year costs of \$15 million to establish the statewide hotline and implement mobile response services.</p> <p>Estimated ongoing annual total costs of \$30 million to maintain the system.</p> <p>Costs of \$159,000 in FY 2018-19 and \$225,000 in FY 2019-20 and ongoing for two additional positions.</p>
---	-----	--	--

Description: Promoting placement stability for foster and homeless youth. Require county child welfare, probation, and behavioral health agencies to establish county-based Family Urgent Response Systems for the provision of mobile crisis-response services to current or former foster youth and their caregivers, and require CDSS to establish a statewide hotline, to be available 24 hours per day, seven days per week to respond to caregiver or youth calls when a crisis arises

Evidence: Placement stability is important for children to develop healthy secure relationships⁹ and serves to reduce the potential stressors that arise from being displaced multiple times. Frequent placement moves not only compounds the issue of being separated from one's parents, but can also result in separation from siblings, relocating to a new geographical area, and experiencing a sense of not belonging; all of which can lead to distress and have a profound negative emotional impact.

(Leaters, Sonya. Foster Children's Behavioral Disturbance and Detachment from Caregivers and Community Institutions Children and Youth Services Review 24(4):239-268 · February 2002)

DRAFT

Exhibit 19. Coordinated services recommendations

Recommendation	Tier	Target population	Potential cost
1. Create a single application for public assistance (ex. within the Single Statewide Automated Welfare System/SAWS)	Immediate	Children and families in poverty and deep poverty.	Low millions for development and coordination. Unknown, potentially major IT costs to facilitate integration.

Description: Institute a “no wrong door”, single application for eligibility of public assistance (including housing, child care, CalWORKs, CalFresh, Medi-Cal, Supplemental Nutrition Program for Women, Infants, and Children (WIC), the Earned Income Tax Credit (EITC), school meals, and more). This streamlined single point of entry to access public benefits could become a national model for states to more efficiently enroll families in benefits. This policy also builds on AB2960 that was just signed into law by the Governor, and which creates a single portal for childcare and development programs, including program and eligibility information, the opportunity to connect with resource and referral agencies and providers, the ability to use an online eligibility screening tool in order to assess eligibility for services, a way to link to local child care resource and referral agencies and alternative payment programs for additional assistance in selecting and assessing child care, and access to placement on waiting lists for local subsidized child care programs. Technology should be utilized to expand outreach regarding availability of these services. As part of development and implementation, access issues must be addressed including language access and the lack of access to computer-based applications and information portals for families in poverty and deep poverty.

Evidence: The largest social safety net programs kept an estimated 7.8% of Californians out of poverty in 2016.

These programs include CalFresh, CalWORKs, the federal EITC and state CalEITC, the Child Tax Credit (CTC), Supplemental Security Income (SSI/SSP), General Assistance (GA), federal housing subsidies, WIC, and school meals. CalFresh and the combined EITCs lowered the poverty rate most, by 2.1 and 2.0 percentage points, respectively. CalWORKs lowered the rate by 1.0 point.

2. Expand voluntary home visiting	Immediate	Children with families in poverty and deep poverty.	Additional state funding starting in tens of million and rising to over \$1.5 billion per year. (Total expenditures may eventually exceed \$2 billion annually, but a portion could be eligible for federal funds.)
--	-----------	---	---

Description: Expand voluntary evidence-based home visiting for low-income families living in deep poverty who are expecting a new baby and/or parenting a child under two years of age. Unmet need and proposed scale/phase – ability to offer services 50%, increase percentage over time.

Evidence: Research shows that home visiting improves cognitive and social development, family safety, parenting, mental health, health behaviors and outcomes, and decreases reliance on public assistance.

3. Create 20 new Promise Neighborhoods throughout California	Foundational	Focus on children and families in poverty and deep poverty but would have positive impacts on other children and families in the designated neighborhoods, without regard to poverty status.	\$100 million annually, assuming \$5 million per promise neighborhood.
---	--------------	--	--

Description: A Promise Neighborhood uses a place-based approach to saturate the target community with cradle-through-college-and-career solutions, including early childhood education, K-12 academic support, college and career readiness, and family supportive services. Promise Neighborhoods tailor their specific set of cradle-to-college-and-career solutions to the local context, but each share the following characteristics: results-driven focus on impacting population-level results; place-based to focus on a specific high need geography; collective impact is achieved through partnerships; the model is community-powered to address local needs and build on local strengths; it relies on both public and private investments and aligns funding streams

to achieve shared outcomes; the model is equity-focused and explicit in addressing disparities by race, ethnicity, gender, income, immigration status, or other factors; and most importantly, Promise Neighborhoods implement a comprehensive cradle-to-college-and-career continuum that addresses all of a family's needs to help them move out of poverty.

Evidence: Evidence from five federally funded Promise Neighborhoods in California (collectively called the CA Promise Neighborhood Network) demonstrates the effectiveness of the model. For example, LA Promise Neighborhood high schools have more than doubled the percent of students who graduate “college ready” (meeting the requirements for UC/CSU admissions) – from 31% in 2013 up to 68% in 2017.

4. Strengthen integration and coordination of key state agencies to ease data sharing among education, human services, public safety, and health organizations	Foundational	Primarily children and families in poverty and deep poverty, but also would impact those at risk of poverty but not in poverty.	Low millions for planning and development costs in each area. Potentially major IT costs in future.
---	--------------	---	--

Description:

Multi-agency MOU: Integrate services of the main state agencies that have most responsibility for reducing child poverty by developing a MOU. The multi-agency MOU could both create new programs, as well as leverage existing state programs/funding. This may include giving preference on funding opportunities to designated Promise Neighborhoods or other high-poverty geographies, offering technical assistance, or convening communities of practice on specific topics.

Coordination across state and local workforce and training programs: Strengthen connectivity and coordination of workforce and training programs at the local and state level; for example, provide funding to support coordination of services for populations with barriers to employment, such as homeless individuals and families. Require shared responsibility for outcomes to ensure that programs affecting relevant individuals learn to work outside of operational silos and programmatic funding streams.

Early Childhood Data Systems: Integrate and improve the ability to link and navigate between early childhood and other data systems to track and evaluate outcomes for children participating in subsidized child care and early learning opportunities, strengthen services to individual children and cohorts, as well as track the reach and impact of programs, starting with establishing a unique identifier for children before school entry and reestablishing a Centralized Eligibility List. Use the data systems to support continuous quality improvement and to link children living in deep poverty and poverty with comprehensive services (for example, developmental screenings, early intervention, home visiting).

Improve data collection practices to identify children with incarcerated parents: Recommend that the state legislature mandate and fund data collection practices at local and county jails and intake and service planning assessments for all child and youth-based service delivery systems to better capture the number of children that are impacted by adult incarceration. The goal would be to then use that data to drive increased resources and better practices within local governments to address the needs of children with an incarcerated parent.

Improve juvenile justice data systems: California's largely local juvenile justice system is supported by poor statewide data infrastructure and inconsistent data collection and reporting practices, which inhibit the state's ability to make data-driven decisions about reforms. Fully fund recommendations made by the California Juvenile Justice Data Working Group in 2016 to replace the Juvenile Court and Probation Statistical System (JCPSS), consolidate state-level data collection in one agency, expand range of outcome data collected, and establish a web-based statewide juvenile justice data clearinghouse.

Data Sharing: Enact legislation to facilitate and ease data sharing among state and local agencies. This may be modeled on efforts such as the Silicon Valley Data Trust, which is a three-county effort to develop a shared data system that includes school districts, juvenile justice, case management entities, mental health, public health, and social services. State and local agencies included in the data sharing agreement would each export their individual-level data into the shared system to be aggregated across all partnering agencies, providing a more holistic view of individual and family needs. For example, a shared data system could flag risk factors across data sources. For a youth in the juvenile justice system, the system could look at their academic level to determine whether they should be placed back in school or find an alternative education option, while also flagging any mental health issues that need to be addressed for that individual.

Evidence: Powered by Data compiled a series of case studies that illustrate the benefits, risks, and conditions for successful data sharing in the social service sector.

In 2016, 16 federal agencies signed a shared MOU to collaborate and direct resources toward federally designated Promise Zone communities. This has led to increased federal investments in these high-need, high-poverty communities, demonstrating the effectiveness of this proposed policy in directing resources to address childhood poverty. For example, the Los Angeles

Promise Zone has secured over \$314 million in federal funds from over a dozen different agencies to support efforts aimed at reducing poverty.

One of the greatest needs within the policy community lies in obtaining better records of the number of children with incarcerated parents. Information about these children, their caregivers, and their needs should be systematically solicited, recorded, and shared to design effective services.” (La Vigne, N., Davies, E., & Brazzell, D. (2008). Broken bonds: Understanding and addressing the needs of children with incarcerated parents. Washington, DC: The Urban Institute. Retrieved from http://www.urban.org/UploadedPDF/411616_incarcerated_parents.pdf

The California Juvenile Justice Data Working Group’s report, Rebuilding California’s Juvenile Justice Data System: Recommendations to Improve Data Collection, Performance Measures and Outcomes for California Youth, makes the case for improving these data systems.

No rigorous evaluation of which we are aware has attempted to evaluate the effectiveness of coordination of these programs, though it is often cited (anecdotally and in qualitative analyses) as a challenge for effective and efficient workforce programs. Indeed, each new version of the federal workforce program inches closer toward integrating disparate systems but there remains opportunity for faster progress.

Exhibit 20. Healthcare recommendations

Recommendation	Tier	Target population	Potential cost
1. Expand Medi-Cal coverage	Immediate	Children and families in poverty and deep poverty, as well as those at risk of poverty.	\$1.6 billion

Description: Expand Medi-Cal coverage to all adults with dependent children, up to 138% federal poverty level (FPL) regardless of immigration status.

Evidence: [Need evidence]

2. Provide funding streams to open clinics in high poverty areas	Immediate	Primarily children and families in poverty and deep poverty.	\$30 million annually
---	-----------	--	-----------------------

Description: Develop a state funding mechanism through the California Health Facilities Financing Authority (similar to “Cedillo-Alarcon capital grant program”), to fund nonprofit federally qualified health centers to expand clinic sites into underserved and high poverty areas (including building school-based health centers).

Evidence: [Need evidence]

3. Develop early intervention and primary prevention programs	Comprehensive	Children and families in poverty and deep poverty.	State costs starting in the mid-tens of millions of dollars, rising over time to the low hundreds of millions, depending on number of low-income families served and scope of services.
--	---------------	--	---

Description: In alignment with Medi-Cal and other health programs, develop and fund comprehensive primary prevention programs (including dental and behavioral health) that deliver children’s health services outside of a clinic, namely, elementary, middle and high school campuses and state and federally-sponsored child care and early learning programs to reimburse nonprofit healthcare providers for primary prevention and early health intervention services provided on these sites outside of a clinic.

Evidence: [Need evidence]

4. Reimburse care coordination	Comprehensive	Children and families in poverty and deep poverty.	State costs starting in the mid-tens of millions of dollars, rising over time to the low hundreds of millions, depending on number of low-income families served and scope of services.
---------------------------------------	---------------	--	---

Description: Pursue policies and develop funding streams to reimburse health providers to provide care coordination, case management, health education services, and social supports for low-income families with children.

Evidence: [Need evidence]